REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 2 stands withdrawn from further consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected as being indefinite with regard to the equation stated therein. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the equation to recite that $0.4Da \leq h \leq 0.8Da$. Support for this equation is noted throughout the specification including, for example, at page 15, lines 7-12. Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 1 is definite within the strictures of 35 U.S.C. §112.

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected, to the extent definite, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)[1] as being anticipated by GUSTAFSSON et al. (US 3,292,980). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the clarification made to claim 1.

As amended, claim 1 clearly recites a rolling bearing for a vehicle comprised of outer and inner rings. Rolling elements are rotatably provided between the outer and inner ring raceways. In particular, a minimum thickness of a part where the outer ring raceway is provided in the axial direction on a middle portion of the outer ring is defined by "h", where h is $\geq 0.4Da$ and $\leq 0.8Da$ with Da being the diameter of each rolling element. As discussed in Applicants'

[1] In view of the 1966 issue date of GUSTAFSSON, we will address this as a rejection under §102(b).

specification, maintaining this prescribed relationship presents several advantages over the prior art, such as the prevention of excessive stress being placed on the outer ring as well as elastic deformation of the outer ring, even when the outer ring is fixed to a light-weight and low-rigidity transmission case (see page 21, first full paragraph). Moreover, it is possible to prevent middle-to-middle contact in the rolling contact parts in order to maintain sufficient flaking life (see page 22, top).

In contrast, GUSTAFSSON merely describes a quiet running bearing assembly utilizing rolling bearings (col. 1, lines 9-11). In that regard, GUSTAFSSON attempts to reduce vibration or noise effects by a specific relationship of the wall thickness of the outer ring "A" and the difference between the outer diameter "D" of the outer ring and the board diameter "d" of the inner ring to not less than 0.15 (see col. 2, lines 43-62). GUSTAFSSON is entirely silent on any relationship with regard to the diameter of the rolling bearings 16 with respect to the radial thickness A. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is patentable over GUSTAFSSON.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that even in the relationship utilized by GUSTAFSSON, the reference is only concerned with a minimum radial thickness and does not disclose any upper bound as in Applicants' invention. Of course, this is true because GUSTAFSSON is not directed toward the problems faced, and overcome, by Applicants' invention. Thus, not only does

GUSTAFSSON fail to anticipate amended claim 1, it cannot render it obvious as there is no motivation, suggestion or teaching to modify GUSTAFSSON with the prescribed relationship of Applicants' recited claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. An early notice to that effect is solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #038920.55820US).

Respectfully submitted,

January 12, 2007

Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:pct